

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/767,473	01/29/2004	Andrew M. Prochl	50N3127.01	3618	
24337 MILLER PAT	7590 05/07/200 ENT SERVICES	9	EXAMINE		
2500 DOCKE	RY LANE	NGUYEN, LE V			
RALEIGH, N	C 27606		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2174		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/07/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
10/767,473		PROEHL ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	LE NGUYEN	2174		

		LE NGUYEN	2174					
The	MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 16 April 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
application application	☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of tapplication, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time.							
b) 🛛 The per	riod for reply expiresmonths from the mailing riod for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth						
Examin	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MEPE 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the polition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of he fee. The appropriate extension the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set for thin (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any sermed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
2. The Notice filing the N Notice of A	of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp otice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte ppeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS								
(a)☐ They (b)☐ They	used amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, in raise new issues that would require further contrained the issue of new matter (see NOTE below are not deemed to place the application in bet	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);					
appe	eal; and/or present additional claims without canceling a			10 100000 101				
	TE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,						
	dments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 s reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
6. Newly pro	posed or amended claim(s) would be all ble claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
how the ne The status Claim(s) al Claim(s) ol Claim(s) re	pjected to: rjected: <u>104</u> .		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of				
	ithdrawn from consideration: 87-103. OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affiday because a	if or other evidence filed after a final action, bupplicant failed to provide a showing of good and rifer presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affiday entered be	vit or other evidence filed after the date of filing cause the affidavit or other evidence failed to o good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
	avit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
See Conf	est for reconsideration has been considered bu inuation Sheet.		condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the a	attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/DENNIS-DO Supervisory P	ON CHOW/ atent Examiner, Art Unit 2174							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 4/17/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant arqued:

(a) Applicant finds no indication in the specified figures or text that the second linearly configured set of fields intersect the first linear configuration of fields.

(b) Gospel fails to account for the AV content to continue to play if a menu option does not select a different selection of AV

The Office disagrees for the following reasons:

Per (a), Wilcox teaches that the second linearly configured set of fields meet/intersect the first linear configuration of fields (figs. 15, 16 and 18; second linearly configured set of fields, for example, 122 meets fields 120 in the scroll state).

Per (b) and in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant elies (i.e., the AV content to continue to play if a menu option does not select a different selection of AV content) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2t 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show noncoviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 37 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1996). The teachings extracted from Gospel was for the feature of an overlay menu being displayed simultaneously with playing of AV content (figs. 3-8; col. 2, lines 1-18; col. 3, lines 38-49; menus are overlaid on the currently tuned/selected live video).